DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 055 TM 810 811

AUTHOR	Park, Wook
TITLE	On-Site Evaluation in Illinois.
INSTITUTION	National Assessment and Dissemination Center for Bilingual Education, Fall River, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-89857-161-8
PUB DATE	79
NOTE	25p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Elementary Secondary Education; *Field Tests; *Formative Evaluation; *Program Evaluation; School Community Relationship; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	*Bilingual Programs; *Illinois

ABSTRACT

In this monograph, technical jargon is avoided and a variation is described from the common approaches to evaluation that emphasize experimental design and pretesting and post-testing. In this variation the emphasis is upon the processes and procedures of the bilingual programs in Illinois and information is obtained by visiting teams, hence the author's reference to "on-site evaluation." Each team had a cross-section of administrators and teachers from other schools, community members, and personnel from colleges and universities. There are three purposes intended by the on-site evaluations: first, provide immediate feedback to the project staff; second, provide a learning experience for team members; and, third, provide the State Office of Education with information on the strengths and weaknesses of bilingual projects. The three purposes are described and the results of aggregating the information involved in the third purpose are summarized. (Author/GK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208055

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

on-site evaluation in illinois

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Smith
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BILINGUAL EDUCATION MONOGRAPHS
3

on-site evaluation in illinois

wook park

National Assessment and Dissemination
Center for Bilingual/Bicultural Education
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140

Published by National Assessment and Dissemination Center,
ESEA Title VII
Lesley College, 49 Washington Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02140

International Standard Book Number 0-89857-161-8

Published December 1979

Printed in the United States of America

The activity which is the subject of this publication was supported in whole or part by the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position of policy of the Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the Office of Education should be inferred.

The National Assessment and Dissemination Center for Bilingual Education is a special ESEA, Title VII project funded by the U.S. Office of Education through Lesley College, Cambridge, Mass. and the Fall River Public School System.

This publication was developed and printed with funds provided by Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended.

foreword

In this brief monograph, Dr. Wook Park avoids technical jargon as he describes a variation from the common approaches to evaluation that emphasize, generally, experimental design and pretesting and post-testing. In this variation the emphasis is upon the processes and procedures of the bilingual programs in Illinois and information is obtained by visiting teams, hence the author's reference to "on-site evaluation." Each team had a cross-section of administrators and teachers from other schools, community members, and personnel from colleges and universities. The use of teams composed of people with different backgrounds or interests is customary among the regional accreditation associations, and we could, perhaps, refer to on-site evaluation as the accreditation model of evaluation.

There are three purposes intended by the on-site evaluations: first, provide immediate feedback to the project staff; second, provide a learning experience for team members; and, third, provide the State Office of Education with information on the strengths and weaknesses of bilingual projects. The present monograph describes the three purposes and summarizes the results of aggregating the information involved in the third purpose.

Two aspects of this report will be of interest to readers. First, the findings summarized here resulted from three successive years of teams visiting bilingual projects. As a result it is possible to analyze trends over time, and the author indeed looks at trends.

The other aspect involves the structure by which information is summarized. Ratings were made by teams for several evaluation questions (dimensions) grouped according to the six goals of bilingual education in Illinois. The reader can study the combination of goals and evaluation questions and infer a set of standards or guidelines. Such standards and guidelines are not as precise as those used by accrediting association, as, for example, acceptable ratios of students to guidance counselors or the acceptable sizes of libraries. Nevertheless, qualitative standards are suggested as one reads the text and tables.

Readers will be able to detect the general status of bilingual education in Illinois, particularly its strong and weak points, and this reader was

struck by one particular aspect of the findings. Even though Illinois bilingual projects are designed as an integral part of the total school program rather than an isolated, peripheral, or negatively remedial part, there was evidence that the articulation was incomplete. The summaries show that instruction is often uncoordinated to the point that a student could be taught the same content twice, once in each of two languages. Perhaps, though, such things are temporary and the repeated use of on-site evaluations with heterogeneous teams will sensitize school people through the cross-fertilization of ideas and thoughts and coordination will result.

Richard W. Willard
Evaluation Specialist
NADC, Lesley College
Cambridge, Massachusetts

on-site evaluation in illinois

Goals and Strategies of On-Site Evaluation

In recent years, there has been growing dissatisfaction among educational evaluators and administrators with the research oriented approach to evaluation, e.g., the pretest/post-test model, which emphasizes the use of objective tests, behavioral specification, and research-type reports. Stake (1974) calls this type of evaluation "preordinate evaluation," and points out that it is often insensitive to the uniqueness of the local conditions, the different value-perspectives of the people involved, and to the client needs. The "preordinate" evaluator spends most of his time preparing instruments, administering tests, processing data and preparing reports, but has little time for observing and understanding the program itself and for communicating with his client. Moreover, the measurement of human behaviors is rarely error-free and bias-free (Stake, 1971). Preordinate evaluation has its advantages, especially when the need for an investigation of a predetermined hypothesis or issue is evident. Too often, however, the evaluator comes in, does his testing, and files a heavily statistical report, but makes little constructive impact on the program.

Taking a different approach that emphasizes classroom observation and immediate feedback as a part of dialogue with school personnel, students, and parents, on-site evaluations were begun in Illinois in FY-73. As described in the *Manual for On-Site Evaluation* (Bilingual Education Service Center, 1976), the evaluations are designed to serve three purposes. The first is to assist the local bilingual education program by providing immediate feedback to the program staff, especially while the program is in the developmental stage. In this sense on-site evaluations may be seen as a "formative evaluation" (Scriven, 1967). The on-site evaluations reported here form an integral part of the local bilingual education program by providing on-going, mid-year feedback for the sustained development of quality bilingual programs at the local level.

The second goal of the on-site evaluations is "to provide a vehicle for involving and inservicing a cadre of people interested in bilingual education, so that their information and expertise will be enhanced" (Bilingual Education Service Center, 1976: 3). On-site evaluations are

intended to help both educators and the public to understand what is supposed to occur, and what really does occur, in bilingual education programs at the local level, by directly involving them in the evaluation activities. To broaden the base of public knowledge of bilingual education, on-site evaluation teams are composed of a cross-section of school administrators, bilingual teachers, all-English classroom teachers, parents, community members, school board members, students and teachers from colleges and universities. A team of a half dozen or so people make a concentrated observation of each program for two or three days. Although local school authorities are not required to adopt remedial action as a result of the recommendations of the team, all evaluations tend to lead to some sort of improvement effort.

The third and final goal of the on-site evaluation is to assist the State Office of Education in identifying overall strengths and weaknesses in bilingual programs across the state in order to influence future program and funding priorities. This function should not be confused with the State's fiscal or program audit responsibilities which imply a direct administrative impact on the local school program. The on-site evaluation function is more service-oriented, for local education programs as an effort to help the state education agency to assume "greater leadership but no greater control" (Kerins, 1973: 79). Each on-site evaluation team leaves its written observations and recommendations with the local school. A copy is sent to the state office where a statewide composite is prepared.

Evaluation Data

The on-site evaluation data reported here were collected during FY-75, FY-76 and FY-77 (or academic years 1974-75, 1975-76, 1976-77). Sixty programs were evaluated in FY-75, sixty-three in FY-76 and ninety-six in FY-77, by forteen hundred and sixty-two people (Table 1). Eighty-four percent of the programs evaluated were at the elementary level. In terms of language, included for three years were Arabic, Assyrian, Chinese, Filipino, Italian, Korean, Polish and Spanish. Two hundred and one programs of the total 229 evaluated enrolled Spanish-speaking students. Although the criteria for selection of schools for on-site visitation did not require random sampling in its strict sense, they do allow representation of a cross-section of the programs in terms of language, school level, program

Table 1
Number and Percent of Program Evaluated:
FY-75, FY-76 and FY-77

	Total Number of Programs	Program Evaluated	
		Number	Percent
FY-75	133	60	45
FY-76	161	63	39
FY-77	230	96	42
Total	524	229	42

model, and strong and weak programs as judged by bilingual education program specialists from the state office.

The evaluators were given two tasks: to complete a summary evaluation form on the basis of consensus of opinions among the team members and to write observations and recommendations. The summary evaluation sheets and written observations are the primary data sources for the present paper.[1]

Findings and Discussion

The main foci of on-site observations were on the six goals of bilingual education in Illinois. Those goals are derived from Article 14 C of the *School Code of Illinois* (Illinois Office of Education, 1976) which authorizes programs in transitional bilingual education in Illinois. The discussion of the evaluation findings will begin with brief overview of each of the six state goals of bilingual education and then go on to report the findings relating those goals.

Goal I: Bilingualism and Biliteracy

"Students in the bilingual program will achieve fluency and literacy in two languages."

A bilingual bicultural program recognizes the value of knowing two languages and being able to function in two cultures. The bilingual program structure to accomplish this goal consists of daily time blocks which are earmarked for instruction in English as a second language, language arts in the student's first language, and content courses taught through the medium of the student's first language.

Taking the model scores as evidence, Table 2 shows that students enrolled in bilingual programs throughout the state are achieving oral fluency and literacy at a superior level ("conditions of guidelines are well met"). An examination of the mean scores indiciate students make slightly better progress in oral fluency than in literacy in both English and their first language. However, the Scheffé method of multiple comparisons, which examines the significance of the improvement over the three years, shows that the improvement in English instruction is statistically not significant, whereas the improvement in students' native language instruction is.

A consistent improvement is also observed in a local evaluation program to measure achievement in two languages. However, it is indicated that the rate of the improvement is statistically not significant.

Looking more specifically into the areas of strength and weakness based on the written observations, the overriding concern appears to be inadequate programming and/or quality of English and native language instruction, although a significant improvement in the latter is noted. Staffing was noted as another problematic area; i.e., (1) shortage of qualified teachers, especially teacher aides, (2) inadequate utilization of the

[1]Evaluators' written observations were content analyzed. Although this quantified data is not reported in this paper due to its unwieldiness, the data has been freely quoted to illustrate the results of the summary evaluation.

existing teacher aides, and (3) ineffective use of language resources available within the school staff.

Local efforts to monitor and evaluate the progress toward Goal I were singled out as needing more attention. Three major problems in evaluation were repeatedly mentioned: (1) a need for diagnostic testing to determine language dominance for proper placement in the language arts component as a prerequisite for adequate placement and articulation of students in other subject areas; (2) a need for achievement test instruments for systematic assessment of student progress in language fluency; and (3) a need for training instructional staff in classroom evaluation skills.

The instructional method was analyzed in two parts: general methods dealing with teachers' techniques of presentation, and individualization which emerged as an increasingly popular alternative to the traditional, teacher-centered instructional method. The proportion of the evaluated programs which utilized individualized instruction increased from sixteen percent in FY-75, to forty-four percent in FY-76, and thirty-six percent in FY-77. Individualized instruction was reported to be a particulary effective method for a bilingual classroom containing different grades and/or language fluency levels, and more than one target language.

The availability of instructional materials was another area of concern. In FY-75, the primary concern of the evaluators was the quantitative availability of the teaching materials, which in FY-76 an increasing number of comments were on the manner in which materials were organized and presented. In FY-77 increased number of comments were made on the lack of audio-visual materials and equipment. Teachers were frequently commended for their effort to develop "teacher-made" materials in FY-77.

Goal II: Achievement in Content Areas

> *"Students in the bilingual program will achieve at a rate commensurate with their own age, ability and grade level in all school subject areas."*

The students enrolled in bilingual and bicultural programs in Illinois are provided with the opportunity to continue to acquire concepts and skills in the content areas, for example, mathematics, science and social studies, through their native language skill in the process of learning English as their second language. Academic credit is given for academic work accomplished in the bilingual program.

When asked to quantify the extent to which this goal is being achieved, the evaluation teams indicated that the conditions of the guidelines are "well met" in FY-75 and FY-76 and "excellently met" in FY-77 (Table 3). In terms of the average score, the performance level for FY-77 shows a significant improvement over the previous two years.

The evaluators were asked to rate the extent to which students in the bilingual program were demonstrating increased achievement in academic areas. Their "impression" was that the "conditions of guidelines are well met" in that regard, and the rate of improvement between FY-75 and FY-77

Table 3

Summary Evaluation Data of Goal II
(Achievement in Content Areas)

Evaluation Questions	FY-75		FY-76		FY-77		Significance of Contrast[2]
	Mode[1]	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	
1. To what extent are students in the bilingual program studying subject matter in a language they can understand?	3	2.64	3	2.90	4	3.10	75 vs 77
2. To what extent are students in the bilingual program demonstrating increased achievement in academic areas?	3	2.32	3	2.45	3	2.74	75 vs 77
3. To what extent do bilingual teachers give grades or evaluations for academic subjects taught in the bilingual program?	4	2.84	4	3.06	4	3.13	Not significant
4. To what extent is there a local evaluation program to measure achievement in academic areas in the bilingual program?	1	1.82	2	1.85	3	2.20	Not Significant

[1,2]See notes under Table 2.

Table 2

Summary Evaluation Data of Goal I
(Bilingualism and Biliteracy)

Evaluation Questions	FY-75		FY-76		FY-77		Significance of Contrast[2]
	Mode[1]	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	
1. To what extent are students in the bilingual program developing English fluency?	3	2.80	3	2.89	3	2.96	Not Significant
2. To what extent are students in the bilingual program developing English literacy?	3	2.62	3	2.61	3	2.74	Not Significant
3. To what extent are students in the bilingual program developing first language fluency?	3	2.66	4	2.95	3	3.17	75 vs 77
4. To what extent are students in the bilingual program developing first language literacy?	3	2.24	3	2.56	3	2.80	75 vs 77
5. To what extent is there a local evaluation program to measure achievement in two languages?	3	1.72	1	1.69	1,2	2.00	Not Significant

[1]Rating scale: 0 = conditions described in State guidelines do not exist, or exist but are generally unacceptable; 1 = conditions of guidelines are minimally met but display substantial weaknesses; 2 = conditions of guidelines are adequately met; 3 = conditions of guidelines are well met; and 4 = conditions of guidelines are excellently met.

[2]Contrast between years is based on the Scheffé method of multiple comparisons.

is statistiscally significant. In response to the issue of bilingual teacher authority to give grades and academic credit for courses taken in the bilingual program, raters indicated the conditions of the guidelines were "excellently met" for all three years.

However, again, the local evaluation programs for monitoring student progress in subject areas were indicated as a weak point. The progress in local evaluation is, despite a steady improvement in terms of modal score from 1 in FY-75, 2 in FY-76, and 3 in FY-77, statistically not significant. In many cases, the evaluation teams questioned the discrepancy between the language proficiency level as identified in the school's grant request for a bilingual program and the subsequent placement of the students in bilingual programs. It is not clear, according to the reports, whether teachers tended to classify students as better in English than the statistics reported in the grant request indicated, or whether such discrepancy is due to the fact that students made substantial progress in language fluency once enrolled in a bilingual program.

It was often noted that evaluators wanted to examine tests, interview schedules and anecdotal records in order to assess student progress, and this data was more often than not unavailable when needed for incorporation in the evaluation reports.

Many reports indicated that bilingual teachers seemed to prefer teacher-centered instruction to student-oriented instruction. However, a positive aspect of the instructional method was that individualization was one of the two areas that showed most significant improvement over the three years, the other being the initiative shown by teachers in developing their own instructional materials. Teacher aides, according to the team reports, played an important part in making individualized learning more effective.

As noted under the review of progress toward Goal I, teachers were often commended for the widespread use of teacher-made materials. One problem was that bilingual instruction in mathematics, science and social studies suffered from the lack or inadequacy of instructional materials developed for bilingual students.

Goal III: Growth in Self-Esteem

"Students in the bilingual programs will demonstrate growth in self-esteem."

Since the development of a positive self-concept is very important aspect of any student's education, transitional bilingual education programs assist students in identifying and accepting their unique cultural heritage while helping them to function better in American culture. Recognizing the diverse languages and cultures that the students of non-English background bring into school as potential assets for a greater American society, an attempt is made through bilingual education programs to insure that these resources receive affirmation in both bilingual and regular school programs. An opportunity is provided for all students to appreciate the cultural diversity of their own community.

Table 4

Summary Evaluation Data of Goal III
(Growth of Self-Esteem)

Evaluation Questions	FY-75		FY-76		FY-77		Significance of Contrast[2]
	Mode[1]	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	
1. To what extent is appreciation for the heritage and values of the bilingual student built into the bilingual curriculum?	4	3.04	3	2.98	4	3.21	Not Significant
2. To what extent is appreciation for the heritage and values of the bilingual student built into the regular school curriculum?	1	1.66	1	1.45	1	1.93	Not Significant
3. To what extent do students in the bilingual program appear comfortable, happy and motivated?	4	3.44	4	3.66	4	3.59	Not Significant

[1,2]See notes under Table 2.

As shown in Table 4, the evaluators observed evidence indicating a strong effort to build into the bilingual curriculum ways to foster "appreciation for the heritage and values of the bilingual students." The most reassuring finding relative to the growth of self-esteem was the extent to which students in the bilingual program were observed to be "comfortable, happy, motivated." In all three years this effective outcome of bilingual education was rated consistently as "excellently" achieved. According to the written comments, more than half of the programs visited in each year provided cultural learning programs through curricular or extracurricular activities. Evidence was frequently presented to indicate that concerted efforts were being made throughout the programs to sensitize the broader school body to the various ethnic cultures within the school community.

However, appreciation for the heritage and values of the bilingual student in the regular curriculum continues to be one of the weakest areas in the program. As the modal score indicates, the evaluators assessed the level of achievement as "conditions of guidelines are minimally met, but display substantial weaknesses." Furthermore, the improvement indicated in the mean scores over the three years in providing the learning experience in different cultures and values through the regular curriculum is statistically not significant.

During the formative years of bilingual education in Illinois, bilingual classes were often held in hallways or storage rooms. While some exceptions were still in existence, beginning with FY-75, reports generally indicated that bilingual program facilities and environments were adequate or excellent, and conditions seemed to be improving.

Goal IV: Program Coordination and Integration

> *"Students in the bilingual program will be provided with a coordinated and integrated learning environment through effective coordination with the general school program."*

The bilingual bicultural program is designed as an integral part of the total school program. Because the limited English speaking student spends a significant portion of his school experience in the general school program, it is essential that all involved school faculty (building principal, cooperating teachers, counselors, social workers) show evidence of committment to the philosophy of bilingual education through involvement in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the program.

State guidelines for bilingual bicultural education programs seek to insure that the bilingual program becomes an integral part of the total school curriculum rather than an isolated, peripheral, or negatively remedial one. To this end, local schools are required to involve bilingual and regular school staff in the development and implementation of the bilingual program. Table 5 presents the evaluation data on the performance of Goal IV.

First, it is indicated that the goal to involve bilingual staff in the devel-

Table 5

Summary Evaluation Data of Goal IV
(Coordination and Integration)

Evaluation Questions	FY-75		FY-76		FY-77		Significance of Contrast[2]
	Mode[1]	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	
1. To what extent is the bilingual staff involved in the development of the bilingual proposal?	4	2.18	3	2.56	4	2.01	Not Significant
2. To what extent are involved regular classroom teachers participating in proposal development?	0	0.84	0	1.47	0	0.92	75 vs 77 76 vs 77
3. To what extent does the daily schedule as implemented reflect coordination between the regular school program and the bilingual program?	1,4	2.14	3	2.63	3	2.40	Not Significant
4. To what extent does regular communication occur between bilingual teacher and regular classroom teacher regarding the educational progress of the student?	1	1.78	3	2.18	3	1.84	Not Significant
5. To what extent is there clearly defined leadership of the program?	4	2.44	4	2.79	4	2.76	Not Significant
6. To what extent is the bilingual program a well-articulated one from one grade to another?	3	2.26	3	2.60	3	2.59	Not Significant

[1,2]See notes under Table 2.

opment of the grant request has been "excellently met" for FY-75, "well met" for FY-76, and again, "excellently met" for FY-77. Comparison of the mean scores shows no statistically significant change over the three years in the attainment level of this goal.

The next question examines the extent to which regular classroom teachers participated in proposal development. It is shown that for all three years the performance level is below the State's standards. As shown in the significance test of contrast of mean scores, the performance level of FY-76 is significantly higher than that of FY-75; however, the performance level of FY-77 dropped back to the FY-75 level. In other words, the participation of regular classroom teachers in the development in the grant request has not improved over the three years.

The coordination between the traditional and bilingual programs, as reflected in daily program schedules, was rated either at "minimal" or "excellent" in FY-75, indicating lack of concensus among evaluators. In FY-76 and FY-77 the coordination was rated by most evaluators to have been "well met." The assessed level of communication between bilingual and regular classroom teachers received an unimpressive rating of "conditions of guidelines are minimally met" in FY-75 and an improved score of "well met" in FY-76 and FY-77 in terms of the majority of the judgements. The leadership structure in the bilingual programs was rated consistently as "excellent." Finally, articulation of the bilingual programs in facilitating student progression from one grade level to another was rated "conditions are well met" in each of the three years.

A review of the evaluators' written comments indicates three main problems in the area of program coordination and integration: (1) some bilingual programs had schedules which either duplicated subjects taught in the regular classroom or totally omitted some curriculum offerings for bilingual students; (2) schools often failed to relate and coordinate the goals and objectives of the bilingual program with those of the total school program; and (3) a need for formal and informal communication between general classroom teachers and bilingual staff before and during the program implementation to exchange student and program information.

The lack of coordination was also noted as a part of the leadership problem. Many reports lauded project directors' and coordinators' enthusiasm and committment as important contributing factors to program success. On the other hand, most negative comments related to the lack of clearly defined areas of responsibility and lack of leadership as one of the causes of weak program coordination in projects. It was also noted that program coordinators or directors were not given sufficient time and support to carry out their duties effectively.

Goal V: Staff Inservice

> *"All teachers and staff members of participating schools will be involved in a comprehensive inservice training program."*

Table 6
Summary Evaluation Data of Goal V
(Staff Inservice)

Evaluation Questions	FY-75		FY-76		FY-77		Significance of Contrast[2]
	Mode[1]	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	
1. To what extent have the bilingual teacher and aide attended the state-wide or regional inservice days?	4	2.36	2	1.92	3	2.69	76 vs 77
2. To what extent does the faculty of each building demonstrate an understanding of the purpose of the program and support of it?	1	1.72	2	1.76	2	2.05	Not Significant
3. To what extent have regular classroom teachers been afforded inservice training related to bilingual students?	0	1.20	0,1	1.29	1	1.56	Not Significant

[1,2]See notes under Table 2.

The bilingual bicultural program seeks to insure through its inservice training program that each person who plays a role in the development of the student (building principals, bilingual teachers and aides, regular classroom teachers), has the sensitivity and skills to enhance the student's success in school. To achieve this goal the district is required to (1) develop a local inservice plan for the entire school faculty involved in the education of the limited-English-speaking student, and (2) to release bilingual teachers, aides and coordinators for five full-day inservice days a year.

As shown in Table 6, the result of the FY-75 on-site evaluation indicates that local programs were reasonably successful in assuring the attendance of bilingual teachers and teacher aides at state-wide or district-wide regional inservice days. The FY-76 programs showed a slippage in performance from the FY-75 level. However, the performance level in FY-77 indicated greater (and statistically significant) improvement over the previous year.

Regular school faculties demonstrate a minimal or "adequate" understanding of the purposes of the bilingual program, and the finding is in general consistent for all three years. The bilingual programs appeared generally unsuccessful in affording inservice training for regular classroom teachers.

It has been frequently pointed out in the written observations that the regular school faculties were not adequately informed of the purpose of bilingual education, and that they were not given opportunities to participate in inservice programs. However, it should be noted that the percentage of the programs which provided inservice to regular school faculties was steadily rising over the years; nine percent in FY-75, fourteen percent in FY-76, and thirty-eight percent in FY-77.

Goal VI: Parental Involvement

> *"Parents and other community members will be involved in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the bilingual program."*

Parents are recognized as excellent resource persons in advocating a need for and developing educational programs which are appropriate for their own children. Thus, the guidelines (e.g. *The School Code of Illinois; Rules and Regulations for Transitional Bilingual Education)* encourage the establishment of a local bilingual advisory committee with parents holding at least fifty-one percent of the committee's membership, and active participation of the parents in the local bilingual program.

Concerning the organizational structure of the bilingual advisory committees, it is indicated that the "conditions of the guidelines are excellently met" and this rating is consistent across the years (Table 7). Inservice opportunities were not readily extended to the advisory council members in FY-75. However, there has been significant progress over the three years, especially, between FY-76 and FY-77. The involvement of the advisory council members in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the

Table 7
Summary Evaluation Data of Goal VI
(Parental Involvement)

Evaluation Questions	FY-75		FY-76		FY-77		Significance of Contrast[2]
	Mode[1]	Mean	Mode	Mean	Mode	Mean	
1. To what extent does the advisory council reflect 51% membership of parents of students in the program who are not in the employ of the district?	4	2.62	4	3.21	4	3.10	Not Significant
2. To what extent have advisory council members received inservice?	0	1.04	1	1.52	3	2.08	75 vs 77 76 vs 77
3. To what extent have advisory council members been involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the program?	0	1.38	2	1.90	1	2.05	75 vs 77
4. To what extent are there parental permission slips for each student in the program?	4	3.18	4	3.52	4	3.14	Not Significant
5. To what extent has the district developed good lines of communication between school and home?	4	2.70	4	2.85	4	3.05	Not Significant

[1,2]See notes under Table 2.

bilingual program also appears to be disappointing, though continuous and significant improvement is seen over the years. Obtaining parental permission for admitting the students into the program and the establishment of communication lines between home and school seemed to have reached nearly the highest level of accomplishment over the past three years, as indicated by modal scores.

It was frequently pointed out in the written observations that communication with parents was hindered by the paucity of bilingual personnel who could understand and relate to parents. The positive side of the picture was that bilingual teacher aides made diligent efforts to visit homes, publish newsletters and other written communications to the home in two languages.

An improvement over the years is also noted in organizing and involving the advisory council, but in FY-76, less than fifty percent of those administering programs seemed to take advantage of the resources available through the advisory council. Frequently, teams observed that bilingual councils met informally but did not keep records of their deliberations.

The evaluators also surveyed parental attitudes toward the bilingual program. There were only a few programs in FY-75, none in FY-76 and FY-77 which indicated presence of negative parental attitudes toward bilingual education.

Summary and Conclusion

Bilingual education in Illinois has been offered on a voluntary basis since 1972, and on a mandated basis since 1976. Bilingual education in Illinois is still in the formative stage. The on-site evaluation is designed to facilitate this formative process of bilingual education. The main purpose of the on-site evaluation was three-fold: (1) to assist local school districts in developing and institutionalizing bilingual education programs by providing "here and now" feedback; (2) to provide a forum for the program staff, parents, community members, students, and specialists to share different points of views concerning bilingual education; and (3) to assist the State Education Agency in identifying strengths and weaknesses, and emerging issues in the effort to best meet the need of students of limited English speaking abilities.

Based upon the on-site evaluation data gathered over the past three years, the following eight areas may be noted as requiring further attention for the continuous growth of bilingual education.

Individualized Learning

An increasing application of individualized learning techniques may be noted as one of the encouraging developments in bilingual education. One of the challenges facing bilingual education in Illinois is diversity of students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, and varying levels of English fluency and academic achievement frequently assembled in a classroom. Under these conditions, individualized instruction appears as the most

desirable technique for bilingual teachers and teacher aides to utilize in bilingual or multilingual classrooms. It is interesting to note that one of the significant findings of the AIR study was that the more grouping or individualized instructions, the greater the gains are between pretest and post-test in English proficiency, mathematics and native language skills (American Institute for Research, 1978, Vol. 3). The progress shown in utilizing individualized learning programs needs to be buttressed by continuing to offer inservice training programs for instructional staff of both bilingual and regular classrooms.

Program Design

Needless to say, program design is an area of crucial importance for an effective implementation of bilingual education. How to develop and manage an individualized instruction program is a question to be dealt with in program design. The appropriateness of the program designs was examined under Goal I and Goal II. The program design delineates the structure and mechanism for student placement and advancement and for articulation between bilingual and all-English instructions. Currently, there are nine models of bilingual education program design which the Illinois Office of Education has officially recommended (Illinois Office of Education, 1978).

According to the observations of the on-site evaluation teams, the program design is one of the most problematic areas in bilingual education. Often noted were the imbalances between the amounts of native language and English instructions and repetition of the same instructional contents as the students move back and forth between bilingual and regular classes. These shortcomings were attributed to the lack of coordination between bilingual and all-English class teachers and to the inadequate placement of bilingual students.

Another problem with program design may be the scarcity and inconclusiveness of research and evaluation data concerning the effectiveness of the program models being implemented. For example, an evaluation study of bilingual education in the City of Chicago indicated no consistent relationship between student progress and program model (Chicago Board of Education, 1977). As the program design is one of the most crucial, yet underdeveloped areas in bilingual education, effort should be intensified to innovate new program models which can best meet the diverse needs of the students of limited English speaking abilities.

Local Evaluation Program

Local evaluation was noted as one of the weakest areas in bilingual education. There are two main problems in local evaluation: First, the language fluency level of the students needing service was inadequately identified due to the lack of reliable language assessment instruments. The inadequacy of language assessment instruments has been repeatedly singled out as a major problem hampering the progress in bilingual education across the nation (Locks, Pletcher and Reynolds, 1978). And second, bilingual teachers and aides tended to rely too heavily on commercially

developed standardized test instruments, often without adequate understanding of testing and evaluation principles. Classroom teachers should be encouraged to develop their own criterion-referenced tests which are more suitable to the specific needs of the local programs (Park, 1977).

Teacher Inservice

In the United States, bilingual education is a relatively new discipline, even though it has existed for more than a hundred years (Cordasco, 1976). As a consequence, many teachers in bilingual education have not been formally and specifically trained in bilingual education. Recognizing the lack of formal training among bilingual education teachers, the Illinois Office of Education requires teachers and aides in bilingual education to participate in at least five workshops and inservice programs. Furthermore, according to the *Rules and Regulations for Transitional Bilingual Education* (Illinois Office of Education, 1978), each school district should develop a local inservice plan for the entire school faculty to increase their understanding of the concept of bilingual education. The importance of inservice for bilingual education staff and those who cooperate with bilingual education programs, e.g., teachers of English as a second language, cannot be overemphasized in the formative stage of development.

However, it was noted that teacher inservice was one of the most poorly performed areas in all three years. Some programs took advantage of the consulting and technical assistance services available at the Bilingual Education Service Center, Arlington Heights, Illinois and the Supportive Service Units of the Chicago Board of Education, but in many cases the failure to provide inservice programs for the all-English classroom staff and the new members of the bilingual teaching staff was particularly noted. As mentioned earlier, future efforts for inservice programs should be concentrated on such essential areas as techniques of individualized instruction, program design, classroom testing and program evaluation, and intercultural communication skills.

Teacher-Made Materials

It was shown that bilingual teachers were becoming increasingly concerned with the quality of instructional materials rather than quantity. It was noted that much of the instructional materials were brought directly from home countries of the students of limited English speaking abilities, and they often were found to be irrelevant to the local learning environment. It was an encouraging finding that classroom teachers were increasingly making efforts to develop their own instructional resources. The ability to adapt the existing materials and create new materials to the specific needs of the students who are undergoing linguistic and cultural transition is critically important to bilingual education teachers.

Growth of Self-Esteem

It has been often pointed out that children who are from non-English language backgrounds suffer from alienation, anomie and loss of identity. Thus it has been increasingly recognized that a main thrust of bilingual

education should be psychological rather than solely lingusitic (Colombani, 1976; Pena, 1976).

One of the outstanding achievements of bilingual education in Illinois is that it has been observed by so many evaluators to have had a positive effect on the growth of student self-esteem. The evaluators found the students in bilingual education programs to be content and highly motivated. Of course, this observation was largely subjective, not based upon psychometric measurements. The lack of instruments in assessing the relationship between culture and self-esteem or self-concept may be another serious problem in bilingual education (National Assessment and Dissemination Center, ESEA, Title VII, 1976; Llabre, Ware and Newell, 1977).

Parental Involvement

Even though in FY-75 parental participation was one of the weaker areas, it appeared that an increased effort had been made since to establish good communication between school and home through formal and informal activities, and these apparently elicited highly supportive attitudes by parents toward bilingual education. It would seem that as long as parents are kept informed of the progress of the bilingual education program, and where the program staff shows the initiative, parents seem to be ready to contribute their resources to the betterment of bilingual education. However, it should be noted that despite the attitudinal support of bilingual education by the informed parents, formal organization of local advisory council, parental inservice, and involvement of parents in active planning, implementing and evaluating bilingual education programs still remain to be the areas needing improvement.

Program Coordination and Integration

It was pointed out that coordination between the bilingual and regular programs was in general poorly performed. First, there was lack of communication between regular classroom teachers and bilingual teachers. Often the regular classroom teachers were not informed of the philosophy and program intent of the bilingual education program housed in the same school building or district. In most cases, the informal interaction between bilingual and regular classroom teachers appeared to be the main channel of communication. Second, providing intercultural experience to non-bilingual students through formal school curricular has not reached a satisfactory level of achievement. Often, bilingual education has been construed as segregative rather than integrative because of the ethnic and linguistic separation. The lack of intercultural and interethnic learning experiences in the school systems may be a major shortcoming of today's American education (Sizer, 1976; Krug, 1976). The real challenge for bilingual education and for American education in general would be how to insure integrative learning experience to all students while maintaining diversity of learning experience.

References

American Institutes for Research. *Evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title VII Spanish/English bilingual education programs.* Palo Alto, Calif., 3 Vols., 1977-78.

Bilingual Education Service Center. *Manual for implementing on-site evaluation of Illinois bilingual bicultural education programs.* Arlington Heights, Ill., 1976.

Chicago Board of Education. *Chicago's bilingual programs: evaluation report 1975-76.* Chicago, Ill., 1977.

Colombani, S. The bilingual pressure cooker. *Journal of the National Association for Bilingual Education.* Vol. 1 (1), 1976 (May), 13-16.

Cordasco, F. *Bilingual schooling in the United States: a sourcebook for educational personnel.* New York: Webster Division of McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.

Epstein, N. *Language, ethnicity, and the schools.* Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, 1978.

Illinois Office of Education. *Application packet for bilingual education program.* Chicago, Ill., 1978. (Mimeo)

_____. *The rules and regulations for transitional bilingual education.* Springfield, Ill., 1976.

_____. *The school code of Illinois.* Springfield, Ill., 1977.

Kerins, C. T. Accountability and the state. In House, E. R. (Ed.), *School evaluation.* San Francisco, Calif.: McCutchan, 1973.

Krug, M. M. Our ethnic politics. *Chicago Tribune* (Voice of the people), January 7, 1977.

Llabre, M. M., Ware, W. B. and Newell, J. M A factor analytic study of children's self-cept in three ethnic groups. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Measurement in Education. New York, 1977.

Locks, N. A., Pletcher, B. A. and Reynolds, D. F. *Language assessment instruments for limited-English-speaking students: a need analysis.* Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

National Assessment and Dissemination Center ESEA, Title VII. *The condition of bilingual education.* Cambridge, Mass., 1976.

Park, W. Classroom assessment for Asian bilingual bicultural children. *Proceedins of forum of transcultural adaptation.* Springfield, Ill.: Illinois Office of Education, 1977.

Pena, A. A. Bilingual education: the what, the why and the how. *Journal of the national association for bilingual education.* Vol. 1 (1), 1976 (May), 27-33.

Scriven, M. The methodology of evaluation. In Stake, R. E. (Ed.), *Perspectives of curriculum evaluation.* American Educational Research Association Monograph Series, No. 1., Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally, 1967.

Sizer, T. R. Education and assimilation: a fresh plea for pluralism. *Phi Delta Kappan.* Vol. 58 (1), 1976 (Sept.), 31-35.

Stake, R. E. Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. Urbana, Ill.: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, University of Illinois, 1974 (mimeo).

_____. Testing hazards in performance contracting. *Phi Delta Kappan.* Vol. 53 (10), 1971 (June), 583-589.

The author wishes to express appreciation to H. Ned Seeley and Ann Garcelon for their constructive comments to earlier drafts of this paper, to Mary McCloskey for her editorial assistance, and to the Illinois Office of Education for making data available for this work. Points of view or opinions stated in this paper are those of the writer and do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the Illinois Office of Education.